

M1516
Monday, January 6, 1969
San Francisco
Group III

Mr. Nyland: Tonight is the last meeting of this little 'series of four,' I call them, of which the first one was for Group III only, and the last three were for Group I, Group II, and III. Tomorrow I'll be going back to New York. I would like to continue very much the same way as what we did in Palo Alto on Wednesday. It was devoted to questions. And you remember, last week I said if you really want to come back and if you really want to find out, try whatever you know about Work, and maybe because of that you will be able to ask some questions about it. But that that what is required is really that one is serious about wanting to find out what is Work and what might be the value.

So, who has any questions.

First one. Yeah. Yes.

Questioner: Mr. Nyland, I find myself always looking for verification, for reassurance that my attempts are in the right direction. Now, this havoc with Impartiality, uh, what can I do about this.

Mr. Nyland: No, I think you misunderstand it. When I want to Work and I want to find out what I really am, I create some kind of an apparatus which I call 'I' in order to collect data about myself. And the rules for that is, when I say I want to 'Work' on myself, it means that 'I' is set in motion and collects facts about what I am, and in order to make them—those facts—more truthful and Objective, the registration of that—the recording—has to be Impartial and if possible it should be recorded Simultaneously. So, regardless of what happens afterwards, during the time when I make an attempt to Wake Up or to be Aware and I collect facts, then I'm required to be Impartial, as far as the 'I' is concerned when it is Observing me.

Now, I accumulate such facts in my mind, and they are registered in my memory, so that

afterwards—when I'm back again, you might say, in 'ordinary life' and I'm unconscious but I'm thinking about whatever has been my experience—I'm thinking then about the facts that I have accumulated, and at such a time I have to be critical, to see if the facts as I then remember them really fit in in an overall idea of what I have and what I should be. And you may have difficulty in trying to define more or less what a Man should become, but you also can be quite critical about that what you have experienced. And those facts cannot be further explained anymore, because they are irrefutable, because they were so-called 'Objectively' received, and that therefore there is no question anymore of having any rationalization process go on. I must accept the facts for whatever they are, and on the basis of that something in me, in my unconscious thinking state, becomes critical about the value of such facts as they are, or the experiences that I have lived through.

So, you mix it up a little bit. Impartiality only belongs to the effort of Waking Up. Afterwards I can use facts that I know now to be right, or sometimes I can compare them with facts which have been received in a subjective way, but of course that what becomes more reliable for me is a fact which is as close to an absoluteness as it possibly can get.

You understand.

Questioner: Yes I do. Thank you.

Mr. Nyland: Good.

Yeah.

New Questioner: Uh, I'd like to know exactly what is meant by the term 'working with pleasure.'

Mr. Nyland: Oh, do we talk about pleasure again? Where is Steve?

Questioner: I ... I've heard you mention Working 'with pleasure' ...

Mr. Nyland: Yeah.

Questioner: ...and I find that in my attempt, after making some Work attempts I often get a very heavy feeling.

Mr. Nyland: Why. Is it so difficult?

Questioner: Well, I dunno. I find I get very critical.

Mr. Nyland: Of what you have seen?

Questioner: Of what I've seen. But this ... my whole attitude is...

Mr. Nyland: Of what is the criticalness? Is it based on what you are? What are you critical

about.

Questioner: Um, the validity of the attempt, and it just carries over into other people and, I would say, critical of everything. I get very ... very weighted.

Mr. Nyland: Is that the result of Work?

Questioner: No, I don't think so. No.

Mr. Nyland: No. So, we don't have to talk about it. I think it's ordinary affair in ordinary life—that for some reason or other you happen to become critical, or you dislike other people or circumstances in which we live. I don't think it has anything to do with Work. If I collect data about myself, there is a possibility of being critical about what I have seen. And I'll get a little angry even when I know that if these facts are really truthful that I cannot do anything about it. Because in ordinary life when I think about myself, I'm very happy when, although the facts may have been ... may be a little bit obnoxious to me, that then I can rationalize about it, and I rationalize them out of the way so then I can even have an enjoyment. But when I collect facts about myself I have to take them for what they are. And of course I may not like the fact and that might make me a little over-critical or disappointed, or something that I say is 'heavy'... But if you Work you should never be heavy, and the result should never be a heaviness. All it is, is an Observation process. And what you really could say—I would like to make an 'I'—it is really much more a "Let me see if ..." then there would be an 'I' if that 'I' could see me really as I am. Now, that in itself is not a very difficult process. It is difficult to have that little 'I', if it exists, continue to exist, but there can be a very definite wish of seeing yourself as you really are, even if it's for one moment.

So I don't understand the heaviness, unless you become so concentrated on this wish to Work on yourself that it goes over into your ordinary mind. And when it's a matter of concentration of an effort which is mental, of course you can get tired of it, and maybe very heavy. The question is for you, find out are you really Working. I doubt it now a little bit.

All right? But, you try it now. See if you can really come back to the simplicity of Work instead of the heaviness.

Yeah.

New Questioner: I wonder if you had answered one of the questions I just had just now. There was ... can it be helpful for Work to be more deliberate, meaning be somewhat more ... I can't really find ... deliberate is the best word I've been able to find over, ah, yesterday at the Land

there were...

Mr. Nyland: Can you hear what he is saying?

Someone: No.

Mr. Nyland: Do you hear that question? Will you repeat it.

Questioner: Would it be helpful to be more deliberate in one's action, somehow take some part in the action, say in walking or in some kind of simple action, is it helpful for Work to do this. Uh, I'm somewhat confused, because there is the one thing of being involved and therefore it's impossible to get simple enough; and the other is, just something was different when I was doing it that way yesterday.

Mr. Nyland: Whenever you try to Observe—and I mean by that, now, whenever the little 'I' tries to Observe you—when things go on in exactly the same way as usual, it may be very difficult to break a mechanicality and send energy to 'I'. When I become deliberate in my motions or movements, something is done by me intentionally in order to accentuate a certain fact, that I wish to Work on myself. That in itself opens me a little bit more—that I'm engaged in something that is worthwhile for me—for that reason I want to be deliberate in my actions, and because of that I'm much easier reminded that there should be an 'I' to Observe me.

Questioner: Will it affect the Observation.

Mr. Nyland: No. Observation has only to do with the object, that it exists. Your deliberateness is totally unconscious, and from the standpoint of 'I' it doesn't make any difference. If I know that I exist I'm not interested in how I exist or a description of what I am, because then I go over into that kind of partiality in which I even give things a name. Only existence. So that Man as he is, in whatever shape he happens to be, becomes an object only, and no description.

All right? Deliberateness is always unconscious.

[silent period] Come,... what happens?

New Questioner: I've had an increasing problem for the last few weeks of being ... of having some kind of confusion or difficulty in Working; and at first I thought it was that I was being too intellectual about it and in my imagination, and then I found I had to use more of an energy to build a wish. And I discussed that with you at the Land, but ever since then if I find myself scattered I can't seem to concentrate even my feeling on why I want to Work. I can't just ... I can't generate that, perhaps, enthusiasm to Work that I wanted ... that I had originally.

Mr. Nyland: What makes you think that you would be a little too intellectual. In the process of

wanting to Wake Up, all I have to do is to try to create something that could function as an Observer. That in itself is not a very difficult problem. Because I can imagine that certain things exist which function ... that it takes place in the brain, and when it is only an Observation which is nothing else but a recording, it does not require special energy, like I would have when the thing becomes intellectual. It's only a *mental* function. Intellect, I can understand when it is functioning in an unconscious way that it requires energy and that if I do too much pondering, or that I have to formulate and cannot find a word or when I think about the structure of sentences; and all of that, I can consider it an intellectual process and I can say, "Yes, it's a little too intellectual for me because it requires too much," but here is a very simple operation. All you wish this 'I' to do is to become Aware of you. So, although you can explain it in an intellectual sense, and sometimes one says 'A, B, C' in order to define what is meant, it's really a simple kind of a thing—that is, to know about. That is, a description of what is required is extremely simple.

Now, the question—if you don't have a wish or that you happen to think about it a little too much, and because of that it becomes too intellectual—that thinking too much, of course is not Work. It's just a consideration. And if in this mind certain things come up which make you a little doubtful, or that you start to compare it with other ways and other, perhaps, insights or other words or things that are based on different kind of concepts, then I can understand that you are a little bit more confused, and because of that the wish is a little reduced.

I think I mentioned to you once that it's no sense of having more than one horse, if you want to ride it. And I think that the lack of wish is that you're still a little bit spread over different directions. Why don't you make up your mind, for six months actually to find out what is the value of Gurdjieff for you, and that you really will not allow yourself to become interested in anything else, than only casual. Because if I really know that if I want to become Objective—again, I mean by that, that if there should be an 'I' which could function Objectively towards me—then I know also that that particular creation, and the accumulation of data and the accumulation of that in the sense then that 'I' remains Awake, is rather difficult. Because it is unnatural, doesn't come easy to me, and sometimes in the beginning I may not be very clear about what I have to do. But that of course can be adjusted when I continue, but at the same time it's a question of the acquisition of dexterity by means of a little 'I' which is very small and does require a great deal of attention if I wish to create it and maintain it.

So, I would say it can be compared to a road you have to ‘dig out,’ as it were. You have to make attempts to acquire a certain dexterity, and that will take some time. So in the beginning even it may not function correctly, and you have to allow a little bit of time and experience in order to give the little ‘I’ a chance to start to grow; and I don’t think you would see any particular kind of results, than only after you have honestly and really quite seriously made such an attempt for a certain length of time. And I say six months, and it is really not asking too much if for six months I devote my time to that particular pursuit and I close the door to everything else.

It’s not that I withdraw. Far from it. But ...—withdraw from life—but I don’t become interested at that time in anything that Krishnamurti has said, or whatever has happened with Meher Baba or any other Avatar that might exist. I say for the time being, “No, I want to find out what is Gurdjieff.” I want to settle that question. After six months you may have an opinion, and you may have a right to say, “He is not for me.”

I think with that one will have a wish. Because then you are really after an aim. If you remain wishy-washy, and no aim and one thing is almost as good as another and you satisfy a little curiosity, you cannot expect to have any wish whatsoever.

You see what I mean by that. I would almost say, “Make up your mind.” If I want to wish to Work, of course I have to have a motivation. But the motivation in this case could even be, “I want to find out, and I give it six months.” It may have nothing to do with my desire to build a Soul, or whatever other kind of motivations there may be. It may not have anything to do with a consideration of what I am ... and I think that I am not complete enough, or that I ought to do something about myself. In this particular case, I simply make up my mind for six months I’m going to give it all I can in order to find out certain things because it intrigues me. And that’s the motivation.

All right?

Questioner: Thank you.

Mr. Nyland: Yeah.

New Questioner: I have ... Mr. Nyland, I have some idea of the effort that’s involved in what’s called Zazen and Zen meditation in a wide sense, and I expect that my efforts will continue in that. But I ... the intellect is part of it, and I should like to know the difference, in what ways the Work is different from Zazen. It seems to me that there is something between them...

Mr. Nyland: Yeah. The question is only now, how much do you know about Work à la

Gurdjieff.

Q: I don't know.

Mr. Nyland: Well, then you see it would be very difficult to tell you what's the difference. It's quite all right—I'm perfectly willing to talk about it—but it won't help you. Moreover, why even the question. If Zazen really satisfies you, why be interested in Gurdjieff. If it's curiosity, I don't think it's worthwhile.

Questioner: Well, it's not curiosity.

Mr. Nyland: Then what is it?

Questioner: I have acquaintances who are very interested in Gurdjieff. I have a serious regard for knowledge of this Work and it may be useful to me, if not now possibly in the future. But it's not arrogance.

Mr. Nyland: You will have a little handicap, because you're still, let's say, more or less satisfied in following Zazen. The interest that you have for Gurdjieff is based on what you see in others in whom you have confidence, and then you say perhaps it's also a method which is good and it may lead to something. I can even understand if it arouses curiosity, but the question is, if it's a matter of dividing your attention in one way or the other in order to find out what is better for you, then I think you have to have a little bit more desire actually to want to find out. Because if I tell you and I give you, let's say, a difference, it will stay in your mind and you will not know if there is actually that difference. Because Gurdjieff, and also Zazen, requires an application of a principle, and if you don't want to apply the principle of Gurdjieff, you will really never know.

I can tell you what you ought to apply and I can also tell you what I think it will lead to ... and what I think Zazen is leading to when one is interested. Because the whole problem centers around what is one's aim. If I find myself on Earth as a Man, my aim should be Manly. Because otherwise I would not be born on Earth ... and I happen to be a part of humanity, and that therefore when I am born with an aspiration in the direction of a possible spiritual development I can understand that I want to go and continue to develop that spiritual side of myself, but I don't think I can so easily forget that I have a body and that I have a definite function to fulfill on this Earth before I can leave it.

So I think if we agree on that particular kind of a premise, that then what is necessary is to find out what is the possibility of a Man reaching his highest point of development, or at what point is it possible that a Man can say he is finished with Earth. Now, this concerns a certain

consideration of the value of Man on Earth, and the question then is: if I understand that I am on Earth, and unfortunately bound to Earth—because it's quite obvious that I am, and that I have to wait until my physical body dies before I am free from Earth—then I ask myself, “Should I continue to be bound, or should my aim be that in some way or other I find freedom even before I die”; so that I don't have to do things after my death, which perhaps, may be so ... or one way or the other but about which I don't know very much, and gradually it would dawn on me that this life may be given to me for a definite purpose to find out how to reach freedom.

Now, on that perhaps we can differ. The other point is, however, that the reason for becoming free is for a Man to become what he ought to be, and that that may be a fusion with God or with higher forms of life. So that the freedom that he is seeking is for the sake of the life within him; and what is not free is his life, and therefore if he wants to set it free there must be a purpose why life, then being free, continues to exist—if that is the assumption, and it ought to be for anyone who is interested in anything spiritual.

So you see, it emphasizes, now, the question of what will life do after it is free, or after I die. And I think on that point we could agree, because it's definitely something, that when I understand life as I am now and contained within myself, that then for me a higher state of Being would be reached if that what is life could join with the totality of all life.

I think it's a good aim. The question is, how soon am I entitled to have that joining take place. Now, if I want to go in the direction of Zazen and I want to understand what it is to become free for a moment, I also know that in Zen that particular concept is emphasized, and if it is actually experienced it will take care of Impartiality. But the question is: What is, then, free? And many times in Zen it is not something separate from me, but is myself as I am. And whatever I am as a Man, and whatever there is what we call the three ‘centers,’ is then for a moment freed from the bondage of Earth.

Now, the question is, then, if I am free as I am now, am I then *that* free that in *that* state I could join, or be fused, with God. And that I think becomes now a little difficult. Because if I consider that, what I am, even if I'm so-called more ‘free’ and perhaps have learned to understand what is the experience of the moment, I still remain as a body, or as an emotional something—part of an entity—and an intellectual capacity, the same kind of a subjective person, only I'm free. And that in this particular kind of experiencing of a freedom, nothing is done to settle my debt to the Earth or to Mother Nature. And there, I think, we differ. Because if I have

an aim to join as soon as possible with God or whatever it is that I call Infinity, then I forget that I was born on Earth. And it doesn't matter if I curse the fact that I was born, I cannot deny the fact that I'm here.

And that is a question of one's Conscience. Because if I have a Conscience regarding that and I take it as a responsibility for what I am now and with what I find myself, I cannot afford, for my Conscience's sake, to negate or forget about certain things, even if I don't like them. And to some extent this prematurely joining of something that is of a higher kind of a nature, leaves that what I really have to do—and I call that a 'payment'—a little bit up in the air. And that therefore, in the first place I don't fulfill an obligation which I think conscientiously I must take on myself, and in the second place I don't do anything about the completeness, or the completion of that what I am as a Man, but I take myself as I am and free myself from whatever bondage there is.

Now, this is the second disagreement. Because Zazen does not assume that a Man on Earth is incomplete and could become completed. It will take Man as he is and lift him away from Earth so that he can live a different kind of a life. And if that is the aim for anyone—one who reaches it, of course, through meditation and all the rest—but the question is, am I really entitled to leave the Earth. And the same restriction is there as by committing suicide: I postpone the question of having been bound for a definite reason. And although I don't know the reason, my responsibility will require me to find out. And therefore it is a little unconscientious. It is a little too easy to go immediately to that desire of freedom. And although in principle it's quite correct, in the application it is forgetting something. And that therefore the emphasis, whenever one would die or even in meditation would be able to join with a higher force, that then in that state I still would have to Work. And that Zazen will acknowledge, because it is not going over immediately to the highest level of Infinity.

Now, I say this: I do not know what it would be if I would leave this Earth and then have a chance to Work. It may be quite possible that the chances for Work and the opportunities for that kind of Work—again, in the direction of freedom—may be much better for myself, but since I don't know I will have to take what I know now. And I think it is far better to settle the questions here first, so that if I do settle them I don't have to worry about them after my death.

You understand that reasoning. It depends how you consider yourself: Do I still have a task on Earth as a Man.

Questioner: I understand. Thank you for the extended explanation of some of the differences, but I ... but in your last question that was being put to me there proceeded then specific, um, specific sentences about my ‘state,’ as it were, in contrast with a feeling about myself.

Mr. Nyland: [chuckle] It’s almost a contradiction in terms, you know, when it is a specific ‘something.’ But, it’s quite right. And don’t forget, I’m not trying to convince you. Because I said it’s a question of one’s Conscience, and I see it as a necessity of Man to settle his affairs on Earth first. Because I’m not entitled even to be considered a child of God, and I surely don’t want to be an angel. I’ve got something to do. And when I think, and with very good reason, that Man is incomplete and whatever may have been the cause, when I believe that his completeness could be reached on Earth, then that becomes my task; that in that particular pursuit I will reach a state of freedom which is definitely comparable to a state of freedom after death, and that even in that kind of philosophy which emphasizes the necessity of the formation, or the continuation, of that what is a feeling into a body, or an intellectual body which is a Soul, that then Man being complete in *that* sense reaches a certain state which is most likely—and I don’t want to say that I know—most likely superior to any state Zazen will reach.

But I don’t want to argue about that, because I’m not a Zazenist.

All right? We’ll let it go at that.

[silent period] You know, sometimes it’s very difficult to formulate a sentence or to formulate what is really in your mind, and much more difficult when it is something that is in your feeling center or in your heart. And it is not particularly given to everyone to be able to say what he really feels, and at the same time, if you only wish to feel you have to establish also a language so that you can actually then in an emotional sense be fed. So I think I wouldn’t call it a form of laziness, but it is definitely based on the non-realization of something that you really need. And I think that when you don’t ask, or when you don’t even make an attempt in forming a few words and even if you stammer, there is something still not developed in you, and that is really the question of a possibility of a spiritual development. And a result of that for you, if you actually remain honest, is that you must come to a conclusion that you’re living very much on the surface. There’s practically no depth, than only in the sense we know it as unconscious states. You can say, “Oh, I’m a tremendous artist.” Or, “I really am a philosopher.” And I don’t doubt it for a moment that you love ... you would call than an ‘intensity’ of your life.

But you see, we’re not talking about that from of life. We’re talking about something that

is of a different kind of a quality, definitely more ethereal and in which your philosophy or your science or whatever it is that you pursue, is of very little help. Because at most what you call ‘depth’ at the present time belongs to your unconscious state. And of course what I mean is, why is there so little interest in Man as a whole about this question of what he is in reality, and does he deny that there is something—we call it ‘spiritual’ value and perhaps religiously tinted, or definitely something that belongs to him now—and which must have a reason that it is implanted in Man and not in an animal or a plant, and that there is definitely something when one starts to think about a Man as he is and you in daily life; that you still not wanting to ask questions about a possible spiritual development, you still kind of believe that everything that you are doing on this Earth is all there is to it, and it is the end when you die.

And this for me is so tremendously interesting. I do not understand why you don’t have interest. I don’t understand why you don’t ask questions. Here you are, a sufficiently large Group, and there is no question “Why should I even want to Work.” But this is exactly the way you take practically everything in life. You go to a Group and you sit there for a little while and you hear someone talk, and afterward you say “Yeah, it’s all right, it’s nice”—yes, this and that—what impression has it made on you, and to what extent has it even penetrated into your skin, or got under your skin, even. Try to be honest with yourself. Because, what is the result for you, and what has it been. Some of you were here, now, two or three times. What is the meaning of all this. Why should I talk in the first place. But if I do talk, why do you come. Surely not to hear me talk. It may be interesting and satisfy your curiosity. But it has to do with *what* I say, also *how* I say it, and why is it that that does not leave you in a certain state in which you say, “For God’s sake, what’s the matter with me, why am I so superficial?” And why is it you don’t know the difference; so that you remain so thin, so absolutely not touched. Have you ever suffered? Have you ever had any particular kind of a problem that you could not solve? Where have you been living all your time.

I don’t mean by that, living in a kind of poverty and suffering because of that, or suffering because you have done something wrong. I mean regarding your own self, that what you are and what you call your body and what you call your feeling, what you call your mind. Haven’t you ever discovered the limitations of yourself? And if you satisfied it, in what direction did you satisfy it. If you come to grips with that kind of a question—of your interest, of the spending of your time and all kind of energies, of your health—in what direction has it gone, and what can

you show. What have you got with that what you have spent. What is now your property. It is always tremendously interesting to me that there are so few questions. But you will go through all kind of rigmaroles and spend even time, and you don't get your money's worth. Not at all. Even if you don't pay.

Yeah, was there someone? I didn't... Yeah.

New Questioner: In making an attempt to Work, I've gotten the feeling that it would be very helpful, if not essential, to have an accurate working idea to the extent of free will that I now possess.

Mr. Nyland: Have you a free will?

Questioner: Well, about the only thing I know for sure is that my ... the conception of it that I had before I entered the Work is vastly exaggerated thanks to my ego; and it's something that I've been trying to whittle down to size, and I have the feeling that there's perhaps a tiny kernel left that I have to understand with some accuracy so that I can draw on it to devise ways to see myself in situations and things like this. And I wonder if you could offer some suggestions.

Mr. Nyland: Have you made attempts to see yourself as you are?

Questioner: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: Have you? You know what I mean by that: To see yourself as you are, and afterwards realizing that that what you are is practically nothing else but a reacting creature. You must also have accumulated certain facts that you are conceited. You also know that this free Will, if you really are honest, doesn't amount to very much. Because you keep on repeating what other people are telling you. I think there's very little originality in you. I think that you are constantly under a certain control from someone else and not your own; and that you have not as yet seen what is really needed in this kind of a freedom, and I doubt very much that you have had any experience of an 'I' existing separate from you. I think you're very much identified with yourself. And I don't think there's anything wrong with it. And I think it is perhaps quite difficult, but I think it behooves you first to find out if you actually know what is Work, and then to see if you have attempted it.

I'm afraid you might be a little prejudiced. Forgive me if I'm wrong in that. But, you know, Work is a different kind of a thing than I believe you conceive. It's quite all right. I'm perfectly willing to explain what it is and then even make a suggestion to you, but I don't know if you want it. You're very much identified with yourself. And if that's the way you want to

live, nobody can quarrel. I surely will not be critical. It's in your voice, unfortunately.

Try to find out, if you really want to, from some of the people who have been coming to these Groups a little longer, what is really meant by Work on oneself. What is meant by the formation and the creation of an 'I'. What is meant really by Impartiality. What is really needed in order to have a viewpoint of oneself that that what one is is completely unconscious, automatic and mechanical, and that whatever you have ever done in your life has remained unconscious. And at the same time you're here, you come for a definite reason, maybe you have attended some of the Groups but I'm afraid your prejudices are still in the way. And if I'm wrong, I'll be very happy if I'm wrong. You prove it to yourself.

Questioner: Could I possibly sort of rephrase what I was asking.

Mr. Nyland: Yeah, please.

Questioner: Um, I understand the Work—what it means of the process by which one tries to see oneself Impartially—it's that you don't have the power to do it at any given moment that you choose, it's an arrogant thing to think that one does, and ... but rather it's almost something that occurs for reasons beyond your control, or it's a matter of grace from Above.

Mr. Nyland: No, I disagree with that. I can choose a moment. I don't have to be dependent on anything that comes from Above. I have to have common sense to choose a moment when I think this kind of an attempt will be successful enough. But I'm quite free. When I wish to Work, I can select any moment that I happen to live. Common sense tells me that when I'm engaged in a variety of unconscious affairs it is a rather bad time, but if I want to wait a little longer, or reduce my unconscious activities, then that moment is as good as any other.

So I think you have to be clear about that first. For instance, as you're standing there now, it's a perfectly good moment to try to be Aware.

Questioner: Yes, better than most, because I...

Mr. Nyland: Well, aside from 'most,' right now and from now on. Because you're not particularly engaged in anything else actively, all you are of course is listening. But it still would be possible here and there to have moments of Awareness.

You agree?

Questioner: Yes, I ... I did that really. Um...

Mr. Nyland: Yah, it's all right; then I would say, try to convince yourself that you do. All right, if there is a chance we can talk some other time. It's quite all right. I don't want to cut it off in

any way, but I think you know what I mean, and there is still opportunity to find out more if you wish.

Yeah.

New Questioner: I had a question, a sort of a problem in skepticism. What, ah, if you started to Work and you continue with and skepticism continues, ah, like it has been present for about three days...

Mr. Nyland: You mean you have been in Work, in so-called ‘Work,’ for some years...

Questioner: No, I haven’t been in Work. I’ve been reading for a long time, and...

Mr. Nyland: Oh. Then almost I would say we don’t count it.

Questioner: Yes. But, once you start Work is there any way of dealing with skepticism? I mean, is there...

Mr. Nyland: The question is, is that what you experience and you verify it as something truthful, there is no skepticism. If there is skepticism, you compare it with that what is perhaps a prejudice, or that what you think already and is not based on any fact. I’m only skeptic about certain things, that I’m doubtful about the result. But when the results are verifiable for me, there’s no skepticism. The difficulty is that perhaps I don’t get results soon enough to be able to say that they are truthful. So then, then I would question “Do I actually Work, and do I get some results or not,” or the question may be, “If I do Work will I get results, and how many and how soon.”

Don’t be skeptical when you have ... don’t have to take what someone else says. About that you can be skeptical because you have your own opinion, but here the question is: Can I use what has been told for my own benefit and then verify with my own experience, and you take it entirely out of the realm of skepticism.

Questioner: You mean you don’t have to worry about the things that you don’t know about or haven’t seen...

Mr. Nyland: No, you don’t have to worry about anything. You know, nobody is telling you to follow Gurdjieff.

Questioner: Well, I mean follow the same ideas that have been...

Mr. Nyland: Yeah, I know. It’s based on all kind of things that one gets from someone else, and then if you believe them, that’s it. If someone says, “Gurdjieff—aha! He was this and that and so forth,” and you say “Well, I don’t want anything to do with him.” Why base it on what

someone else says.

All right?

Questioner: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: Okay.

Yeah.

New Questioner: Sometimes when I'm feeling deeper than my thoughts I feel that I want to be closer to life in other things and other people some way, or in myself, and I wonder if it can only be known, for instance, with myself through my manifestations, and ... or if there was some other way of getting that—some kind of closeness.

Mr. Nyland: What do you want to be close to.

Questioner: Simply ... something that I call 'life.'

Mr. Nyland: Of yourself? Or someone else.

Questioner: Both.

Mr. Nyland: All right, let's start with you. What is lacking.

Questioner: Uh, a certain, ah, reality...

Mr. Nyland: Now wait a minute. Reality—of what. You exist. There is your body sitting on a chair, *that* we call 'reality' on Earth. Now, if I talk about ethereal values, something that is not so easily either put in words or that I cannot touch, it may be a little bit more unreal. Now if I say that that what exists as God is quite unreal to me because I cannot touch him, I only can pray to Him and perhaps He doesn't even hear it. Now, if I consider unreality as something that is still desirable if there were a chance to make it real, it is quite possible that if I say that what I am as a person now on Earth is for me 'reality,' but that what I consider what I really am as life is still unreal to me because I have no experience of its reality.

You see? Now, I would like to know to what extent can I consider the unreality, which now also exists for me as unreal, making it real, and to what extent, then, that what I now call 'real' would become unreal. It's quite obvious that if I am on a certain level, that that what is Above is unreal because I don't experience it, what is on this level is real for me. So the indication would be, the more I will get away from where I am in the direction of what I say 'Above'—that is, of what I call 'progress' for me—then that where I will live gradually from one level to another, or extending further and further away from the Earth, will then become real, and that what I will look at as having come from will become unreal.

So then it becomes a question of what I am in this body, and what is for me unreal which I would like to make real. Then I say it is ‘alive’—aliveness. Now, there are times that the form in which I happen to live does not show very much aliveness, and still I know it exists. And the question then is what you say: How can I become more alive. In the first place, I may attach certain values to my body, or that what I am on Earth, which require for me an attention which I do not wish to give it, but when I do give it it prevents me from seeing what I now would like to call the ‘real reality’ of my life. And I may be handicapped in trying to express that life because of a condition in which my body happens to live—that is, the conditions, actually materially, of that what I have to feel and that what I have to think about. So maybe by the simple process of changing such conditions, I may have a chance that more of my aliveness can come out.

That would be one way. The other is, that if I live and I find that there is a little too little life and much more what I have to call ‘my own’ reality, that then I try to find certain ways by which I can understand life a little more, emphasize it more and pay less attention to that what prevents me. In that sense then, when I look for a reality which is now above me, my thoughts and my feeling should go in that direction and try to loosen themselves from that what has to remain on Earth, which is my body; and that sometimes I say, “If I only could connect with the aliveness in me, I would have wings to fly away.”

So you see, these are the two solutions. The first is the realization of that what is life, which is hampered by that what is not life but form. The other is the emphasis on life ... and looking at that what is form as something what hinders it but can be removed when I am not placing the accent on the form, but this time on life. As far as Work is concerned, when I want to emphasize the necessity of an Awareness, I really talk about a new life that I wish to consider which is free from the form in which I happen to live. And actually when I say that what is ‘I’ should ‘Observe’ me, what I’m after is the Observation of life in me, and not the form. And for that reason we say that ‘true’ Observation must mean the acceptance only of the form in order to be able to have an experience of life.

You understand that. When I say ‘I’ Observes me and this process has to be Impartial and it has to be free from time, I now look from a standpoint towards that what I am, straight through to the aliveness. Because I accept the form for whatever it is, so I don’t get stuck about it. *That* I call Impartiality. When I say ‘Simultaneity’ I talk about the eternity of my life within me, not bound by any time limit. So when I now fulfill or try to make this attempt in accordance with

these little prescriptions, then that what is reality for me is touched by the Observation of ‘I’; and then everything, at such a moment of Awareness, as if it could be continued as an Awakened state, will cease to exist, will lose its value and will give me the freedom that I’m looking for. So in reality I would actually become acquainted with life and less and less acquainted with the form it happens to be in.

Of course, it’s a difficult process. Because my whole education is based on something entirely opposite. I take constantly that what is personality for the life of a person. And I realize it is not really their life; it is only happens to be an expression of it, and if I have to find their life, something in me that I create like ‘I’—giving it life of existence because of its creation and giving it Objectivity as an attribute—becomes for me a new form of a life concept. And when I now say “Observe me,” I bring about a contact between that what is life in that new kind of idea or entity, with that what is life within me; and the realization of that, when it is accomplished gives me an Awareness of the reality of what I am, and if it continues that what is then life is Awakened.

Questioner: Is this it: More and more life goes into this...

Mr. Nyland: I think that more and more life will go in the concept of ‘I’. I think that what is life within me, when I wish to continue to Work, will be used for the formation of ‘I’, and that less and less will be necessary for the maintenance of my body. To some extent I make a decision. That is, I find myself with energies and I see that there are possibilities for the maintenance of myself as I am, and also as that what I wish to create for my own benefit. And that the question of wishing to Wake Up, or wishing to Work on myself, means that at that point I take energies available and I allow energy to flow into my ordinary unconscious state to maintain myself, and at the same time I allow, for some reason or other, energy to go to the possibility of maintaining ‘I’. And that is really the process. It is based on the realization of my aliveness, and that what is alive in me will enable me to make this decision between one or the other as a road of energy to flow. The more I am convinced that I am alive and wish to be free, the more intense my effort would be to try to Wake Up.

Questioner: My mind...

Mr. Nyland: Your mind will follow. It doesn’t matter. It’s not a question of your mind. It’s a question of your feeling, and the feeling being deepened and becoming emotional will then fulfill two functions. One is the wish to create ‘I’, and the other is to open the road towards God.

New Questioner: I wonder if you would say something about reading Beelzebub for the fourth time.

Mr. Nyland: Fourth?

Questioner: Yeah.

Mr. Nyland: Have you read it three?

Questioner: Yeah.

Mr. Nyland: Don't read it for the fourth time. If you have read it really three times, and if you have read it in the way that he intended it; so that actually when you read it for the third time, and having profited by the first two readings, and you have done it well, there is a definite attitude in you that when you read it for the third time you are trying to find out what is the application for you in your life, where material is given in descriptions ... of Beelzebub's talks about his trips to the Earth; so after the third reading you should have already a great deal of food that you should have digested. I think you have to question yourself about that first—what has been the value in the third reading—and the conclusion you must draw is: to what extent have I seen myself in that book, and did I actually realize that Gurdjieff was talking to me and writing for me.

Now, I'm quite certain you didn't do that. I'm sure that the third reading was not sufficiently productive, and instead of calling it now the 'fourth' reading I would read it again, but this time how I should have read the third time.

You understand what I mean. You did not get out of the book what you should have gotten out of it.

Questioner: I'm quite sure it will be a book that I read ... I'll be reading for the rest of my life.

Mr. Nyland: Oh, I believe that. You see, but we are only talking about the third or fourth reading, not when you come to a hundred. Read it again, will you?

New Questioner: Um, often when I make attempts I feel I can't let go of myself.

Mr. Nyland: Wait a minute. You let go of yourself?

Questioner: Well, I feel like I'm caught up in the attempt.

Mr. Nyland: Yeah.

Questioner: I make a Work attempt and I'm ... something in me starts to ... I'm identified with it.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, so it's no Work attempt anymore.

Questioner: No.

Mr. Nyland: Then you have to stop it. Then you have to start over again.

Questioner: Then ... and if it's the same...

Mr. Nyland: Then you start over again. If I'm on the wrong road and I find out each time that I'm on the wrong road, if I telephone and I get the wrong number and I try it for the second time and get the wrong number and the third time the wrong number, maybe I call the operator. [laughter] You see, but I don't continue getting the wrong number. Of course, it's obvious: You go back again; and if the operator isn't there, read All and Everything—that may be an operator. It's a simple question, it's also simply answered. If you're wrong you're wrong, try to get right. It's not a question of getting caught. I don't think you get caught so easily in an attempt to Wake up. What you mean is, that you fall back into ordinary life. And that of course is true—all of us do that.

Does it answer you. Yeah? All right.

Yeah.

New Questioner: Can you tell when you have accomplished something when you've been Working correctly?

Mr. Nyland: I think you can. I think there is a possibility that after one has made several attempts, and it may be definitely different for different people, that there is something that takes place in you. It may not be formulated so easily. I think in the first place, whenever I do anything with a full wish something already takes place, because there must be that kind of a desire—that I am interested in finding out something. Usually as a result of that I'm in a different state, and if that is maintained I will continue with that wish. The wish of course is linked up with the motivation of why I want to wish, but when I really am interested in finding something there is a concentration within my body, or within the different functions and organs of myself, more or less interested in what I can find out about myself, because that's the purpose.

I think that after a very short time a person will find out that he is discovering many things he has never seen before, simply because he has made that attempt already to pay attention to himself. It does not mean that that what he is seeing is already Impartially Observed, but in the first place it will enlarge his world. He will be noticing that he has been, regarding different people, in a certain way where it was completely habitual; without any particular rhyme or reason, or that he has been talking a little too much, or that certain words were out of his mouth before he noticed it. And all kinds of attitudes that one has when one becomes interested in

oneself, and when this interest is more and more directed towards becoming Impartial, one can then make sure that what I Observe—what this little ‘I’ Observes—is actually the truth. But there’s a long period that I increase the knowledge of myself, even if that knowledge is not as yet as pure in an absolute sense as I would wish it.

This is one way, and I think this increase in interest in myself in this world and leading also to a certain interest of other people. Because if I associate with an idea, not only of Objectivity but that what I say “I am mechanical,” and someone else is mechanical and everybody is mechanical, that I become interested in seeing how mechanical they are. And I’m not such a fool; to say “Look, I can see it in someone else, I’m the same way—or the same kind—because I’m also a person, an unconscious Man.”

That is one way, but the other is that when I reach a certain state in which there is something in me that becomes Observant of myself, something takes place in myself of having received a fact about which there is no further question. This is an entirely new kind of an experience. Because if I look at that what I know about myself, or even what I feel about myself, I know well enough that whenever it starts to touch me a little bit in a bad or in a good way, that I start to question the validity. And in this case I would get a fact about which I cannot even think, because it is already there. For this reason Gurdjieff calls it ‘constating’ a fact. Constatating means it’s more than stating. Constatating is that that what I ‘state’ is with me ‘con’; that is, the totality of myself is Aware of that what is the truth. This particular state in oneself—when there is not any possibility of questioning the fact that one has received—produces, comparing it with other facts which are questionable, a certain joy. It is then as if at such a time I acquire knowledge that I have never had before—but that now, for some reason or other, I have to call ‘Objective’—which will help me then, and the joy is a result that I now apparently have at my disposal certain facts which never were available.

This is the second thing, the second experience. The third is another one. The third is the actuality of that when I now am Observing, or when the little ‘I’ is trying to Observe me and when the little ‘I’ for me represents light—that is, insight into that what I am—that because of that, that what I am unconsciously becomes aware of a light which is around me, or somewhere I would almost say ‘shining’ on me or in some way or other Observing me, the result is that this ‘me’ unconsciously is aware of something else which never was there before. This I call a ‘taste’ of that what I am in an unconscious state, and the taste takes the form of an emotion. Because it

is something so unusual to me ... it is not my body that reacts, it is my emotional state that starts to recognize this kind of a situation, and the only way I can explain it is, there is a light around me and I *feel* it is right for me.

Those are three ways by which one can know that one has Worked. Many times one simply continues, partly basing it on a question of belief that when I make an intense effort and I concentrate with all of myself on the accomplishment of something, that then that *must* have a result. It is a belief, but it is many times proven that if I'm all there, there is something that definitely takes place with me, and also in such a case when that attempt is made it has a definite physiological change. But it is much more difficult to distinguish between such a state of the physical body and a state after one has Worked or in the process of Working, so I don't want to mention that now—I do, however.

Yeah.

New Questioner: I've heard on a tape recently and I've read things about Gurdjieff in other areas—about some religions and so forth—but All and Everything I found ... ah, I didn't find too much discussion on psychoanalysis and I never had heard any comments on it. And I personally spend a lot of time doing a lot of reading and, ah, sort of like the question of how Zen fits—it isn't a good question—could you comment on psychoanalysis as a school rather than as a health treatment.

Mr. Nyland: Would you like to know what Gurdjieff would say?

Questioner: Yes, that's what I'd like to hear.

Mr. Nyland: Do you know what he would say ... do you understand the word 'Hasnamuss'? [laughter] All right, that lets me out. No, it's quite obvious it's quite different. Psychoanalysis is a description of a subjective state.

Are we at the end, almost?

Answer: Almost.

Mr. Nyland: Yeah? We cannot call it an evening yet?

Yeah.

New Questioner: I have a specific question, that while...

Mr. Nyland: Let me see you. Where are you. Ah, okay.

Questioner: ...that while I made some attempts to Work, or to Awaken ... and I'm not sure that my attempts are, um, Working on myself in the Gurdjieff sense. And, uh, one of the

characteristics that he noticed about the type of work that I do was that it was possible to perform while being physically asleep, and I was wondering if that is a characteristic, or if I was...

Mr. Nyland: Who said it was? Or, was it your experience?

Questioner: Yeah, my experience. I'm saying I don't know if my work is in any way related to the Work that one does on oneself in the Gurdjieff sense of the word, and I was wondering if as you define Work, if it's possible to be performed while being physically asleep.

Mr. Nyland: Well, I talked about that not so long ago, I don't know which evening it was—of the possibility. There is a slight possibility of an 'I', when it exists and you might say is sufficiently 'left free' when one falls asleep, that it will continue its existence. And I called it then 'hibernation' for one night. It does not mean that what is 'I' remains in existence when it's not sufficiently fed, but there is a possibility of an accumulation in 'I' of certain kinds of food which, when 'I' is not 'called upon,' as it were, to function, can help to keep 'I' in existence.

It is one way of saying it, there is another. That is, if 'I' represents for me a contact with a higher form of living, even if I consider that a planetary level—that is, the level of the planets—or if 'I' could actually resemble that what is a solar level for Man as Man is living on-Earth, that that then this 'I', when it is sufficiently grown receives material from 'Above,' as it were, and that then in the process when the physical body is asleep, the 'I' is not dependent on an Observation process or on the part of myself wishing to Work, but it can remain in existence as being fed by forces from a different realm.

So, I don't want to say now much more, than only the verification of oneself when the physical body is asleep—to know that 'I' still is alive and exists and not asleep—the difficulty would be to verify that. Because I would have to have another kind of an 'I' which could become Observant of the first 'I' when the physical body is asleep, and then I think we would go a little bit too far in the philosophy of it—although the actuality is a different way, and one can experience it.

Questioner: Thank you.

Mr. Nyland: Oh.

New Questioner: When there is an 'I' there that is created and is starting to function, is starting to Observe the manifestations of the false personality...

Mr. Nyland: Wait a minute. Wait a minute. I don't like 'false' personality.

Questioner: Well, I mean the personality as we have learned it as we have grown up, in the

relationship of...

Mr. Nyland: You understand, we talk Gurdjieff. We don't talk Ouspensky. It Observes your body. All right?

Questioner: In the body.

Mr. Nyland: Yeah. Not personality, even.

Q Questioner: In Observing the body manifesting.

Mr. Nyland: Yeah. What's the question.

Questioner: The question is, is there any suffering for seeing the falseness?

Mr. Nyland: No, no, no. No. Excuse me, you use the word 'false' again. There is nothing false about it. I've called it 'reality on Earth.'

Yeah, but let's be clear.

Questioner: Observing reality on Earth.

Mr. Nyland: Huh?

Questioner: Observing reality on Earth.

Mr. Nyland: Observing your body.

Questioner: Observing your body is a suffering?

Mr. Nyland: If it is suffering, you're not Impartial. You make that statement with your ordinary mind. 'I' does not know that that body is suffering. 'I' is not the mind as we know it. 'I' is a mental functioning, only knowing Awareness and what I've explained before: also having an attribute of Benevolence, which is an emotional quality which is also created at the time when 'I' started to exist. But there is no question of the suffering. The suffering is within your ordinary body as it is on Earth, and you suffer—your body itself, you think about your suffering, you feel to some extent suffering, whatever it is—so as soon as you bring in the word 'suffering' you cannot talk about 'I'.

Questioner: Are there different states of emotional something, Awareness ... that appear with that.

Mr. Nyland: I didn't hear the last.

Questioner: Are there different states of emotional...

Mr. Nyland: Of course there are. When one talks about affairs of Earth, we talk about feelings and thoughts and conditions of the body. And of course there are different intensities in feeling or even certain emotional states, and of course there is suffering on Earth. There is pain on

Earth. There are all kinds of facts on Earth, and interpretations of them. The question is, if something can Observe them, that something is Objective to that what is of the Earth, and then one doesn't talk at that time, in an Observation process, about the conditions as they are as seen from the Earth itself. The standpoint is different.

Questioner: Is Waking Up painful?

Mr. Nyland: Why would it be. When you Wake Up in the morning, is it painful to open your eyes? Why would it be painful. The Wakening state will give you a chance to see what you are. Now, if you would consider that painful when it sees what you are ... but again, the 'I' does not see that. 'I' only recognizes that you are. When afterwards you consider your own condition painful, you're thinking about it. The concept of Objectivity as being non-subjective, is entirely different from anything that has to do with subjectivity, and as long as you use terminology of a subjective world you will never describe an Objective world. Take an ordinary case. If I die and there is an emotional state or a body that continues to live, what is there for that emotional body to express itself when there is no physical, nothing whatsoever. I cannot even say it 'thinks' because I don't know, but surely it won't talk—not in the language I know, it won't have any so-called 'I'. Everything physical has dropped away, and still it exists. I call it 'emotion,' and that is only a little step towards the possibility of Objectivity. Because the 'I' is not primarily the emotion. I include under an 'I' the possibility of a Soul, which would be an intellectual development as an entity of Man becoming a Sun regarding that what is his body, when the body is the Earth for him.

Have you read Gurdjieff?

Questioner: His books.

Mr. Nyland: Huh?

Questioner: Two of his books.

Mr. Nyland: Which ones.

Questioner: Beelzebub and Remarkable Men.

Mr. Nyland: Did you read Beelzebub more than once?

Questioner: Twice.

Mr. Nyland: Twice?

Questioner: Twice.

Mr. Nyland: Did you read it aloud, or as if aloud?

Questioner: The first silent, and the second aloud.

Mr. Nyland: Are you going to read it the third time?

Questioner: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: I hope you'll get more out of it than you have gotten out of it so far.

Questioner: I'm finding it difficult to putting his ideas into practice in relationships ... with everyday relationships.

Mr. Nyland: Naturally. Naturally. Try it at such times when the conditions are a little more conducive. Try it when there is ... practically nothing happens in the outside world regarding you. Try it when you're very quiet and there are no other people around. Try it when you have a little time. Try it when you sit and eat by yourself for breakfast, or when you're standing in front of the stove frying an egg, or when you dress. Try it at such times that there is a possibility of really finding out what it is to try to Wake Up.

Have you done it? Take tasks like that. If you drive a car, don't go into the car immediately. Wait before you touch the handle of the door. If you can, see if you could at such a time come to yourself so that something is Aware of you standing there, and then open the door and become Aware if you can—that is, the 'I' becoming Aware of your arm moving, turning the knob, pulling the door open, you with your body going and sitting in, resitting, perhaps putting on the safety belt—whatever you do *before* you drive. These are the things that are of course automatic and completely mechanical, and you stop sometimes such particular activities in order to have a chance for the 'I' to Observe that creature that is doing all of this.

It is not difficult to find a moment when you wish to Work, and there is no question that one can or cannot Work. There is no question about it. One can Work. It may not last. But there can always be a wish; and then a wish to Wake Up, maybe it lasts for one moment, but if you try it in conditions where it is already utterly impossible to start with, wait with that. And it's only the manifestations of the physical body. No Observation of your feelings, no Observation of the intellectual processes. And it's only a recording. I exist. This body exists. This body is walking. This body makes gestures. This body has a facial expression. This body talks. Tell yourself 'It' is talking, and maybe an 'I' can actually listen and say, "Yes, it is talking." Forget about Ouspensky for a little while. Read Gurdjieff.

I think we end. Yeah? Allowed? This is the last time, as I said. I hope to be back some time in the early Spring and I hope we can meet again, but don't forget these Groups continue.

As you know, there are Groups II and III. For those who are really interested, come to Groups. You will find a stimulus. You may not find in a Group answers to all your questions and maybe the Group is not stimulating enough for you to read and to study and to do some research about yourself, but at least you will have a chance to become sufficiently positive to know of what is involved. Even if you say, "I'm not going to do it," at least you will not be prejudiced. But I would advise you actually to try for six months; to see what can happen, and maybe you'll find out certain things that are important.

Good-night, everybody.

End of tape